

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **17 August 2005**, the examiner reviewed claims 25-51. Claims 25-28, 30-37, 39-46, and 48-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zizzi (USPN 6,185,681, hereinafter “Zizzi”) in view of McBride (USPN 6,292,899 B1, hereinafter “McBride”), and further in view of Sutter (USPN 5,924,094, hereinafter “Sutter”). Claims 29, 38, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zizzi in view of McBride, and further in view of Sutter, and further in view of Brogliatti et al. (USPN 6,564,225 B1, hereinafter “Brogliatti”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claims 25, 34, and 43 were rejected as being unpatentable over Zizzi, in view of McBride, and further in view of Sutter.

Applicant respectfully points out that Zizzi teaches storing information about which **file to encrypt and which key to use** within a file administration table (see Zizzi column 7, line 64 to column 8, line 4). Furthermore, Sutter teaches storing information about *which column within a given table is encrypted, encryption algorithm, key lengths, and encryption key within a given table definition* (see Sutter column 59, line 11 to column 60, line 26). The combined invention of Zizzi and Sutter teaches storing information about which file/column to encrypt, which encryption key to use, the encryption algorithm, and the key length **within a given table definition**.

In contrast, the present invention *stores information about the encryption key in a metadata table, which includes information about which column is encrypted, the key identifier for the encryption key used to encrypt the column, the encryption mode, and the cryptographic function used to create the digest* (see FIG. 2; and page 8, lines 4 to 12).

The benefit of storing information about the encryption key in a metadata table is that a given table definition does not need to be modified when adding new columns to be encrypted or removing encryption from currently encrypted columns within the given table. Instead, an entry is added in the corresponding metadata table for the given table to specify the encryption information. Furthermore, by storing information about the cryptographic function used to create the digest, the system is not limited to a predefined cryptographic function for creating the digest.

Note that the combined invention of Zizzi and Sutter does not teach storing information about the encryption key **in a metadata table**, which includes information about which column is encrypted, the key identifier for the encryption key used to encrypt the column, the encryption mode, and **the cryptographic function used to create the digest**.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 25, 34, and 43 to clarify that the present invention *stores information about the encryption key in a metadata table, which includes information identifying the cryptographic function used to create the digest*. These amendments find support in FIG. 2, and on page 8, lines 4 to 12 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 25, 34, and 43 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 26-33, which depend upon claim 25, claims 35-42, which depend upon claim 34, and claims 44-51, which depend upon claim 43, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 19 September 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665